



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of:

OKADO, Yoshio, et al

Group Art Unit: 3754

Serial No.: 10/693,862

Examiner: James F. Hook

Filed: October 28, 2003

P.T.O. Confirmation No.: 4084

For: FUEL HOSE

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

December 11, 2006

Sir:

Reconsideration of the rejection contained in the Office Action dated September 11, 2006, in the above-identified application in view of the following detailed comments is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-8 again were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the patent to Kakiuchi et al in view of the patent to Coran. In making this rejection, basically the same reasons as set forth in the initial Office Action were relied upon. In particular, it was asserted that the Kakiuchi et al patent teaches the hose as set forth in the independent claims with one exception. Specifically, it was acknowledged that the patent does not teach an acrylonitrile-butadiene rubber having an acrylonitrile content of 15-30% by weight (claim 1) or having a skeleton derived from acrylonitrile (claim 5). However, it then was asserted that the use of such a rubber is taught by the Coran patent

*Request for
Reconsideration
OK for entry
at time of
appeal.
JFK
11/4/07*